

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Adoption of its Smart Grid Pilot Deployment Project (U39E).

Application 11-11-017  
(November 21, 2011)

**DECISION GRANTING THE INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF THE BLACK ECONOMIC COUNCIL, NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN COALITION, AND LATINO BUSINESS CHAMBER OF GREATER LOS ANGELES FOR CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 13-03-032**

<b>Claimant: Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles (collectively, the Joint Parties or JP)</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 13-03-032</b>
<b>Claimed (\$): \$47,777.00</b>	<b>Awarded (\$): 35,643.88 (~25.395% reduction)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Kelly A. Hymes</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

- A. Brief Description of Decision:** D.13-03-032 approves in part, and denies in part, the application of Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) for approval of six Smart Grid deployment pilot projects. Ultimately, the Commission approved four pilots, including a Line Sensor pilot, a voltage and reactive power optimization pilot, a short-term forecasting pilot, and a detect and locate outages and faulted circuits pilot.

**B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:**

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	February 3, 2012	Verified.
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:		

3. Date NOI Filed:	February 6, 2012	Correct.
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed?		Yes, the Joint Parties filed the NOI within 30 days of the prehearing conference. The NOI was timely filed.
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	Application (A.) 10-11-015	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	July 8, 2011	Verified.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.11-11-017	Verified.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 9, 2012	Verified.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision	D.13-03-032	Verified.
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	March 27, 2013	Verified.
15. File date of compensation request:	May 20, 2013	Verified.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

**C. Additional Comments on Part I** (use line reference # as appropriate):

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
8		X	<p>The Administrative Law Judge’s July 8, 2011 ruling in A.10-11-015 required Joint Parties to file signed copies of their amended by-laws. Joint Parties rely on the July 8, 2011 ALJ ruling in A.10-11-015 to support their claim as eligible Category 3 customers. The July 8, 2011 ALJ ruling in A.10-11-015 found Black Economic Council (BEC), National Asian American Coalition (NAAC), and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles (LBCGLA) preliminarily eligible as Category 3 customers, stating:</p> <p>“None of the offered amendments or amended bylaws contain the relevant signature pages, instead they merely state the amendments were adopted. Although this would not be adequate for any legal purpose, I accept it on good faith for purposes of a preliminary finding of eligibility. However, in order to perfect the record, if and when Joint Parties [BEC, NAAC, LBCGLA] files a request for IComp, the amendments must be resubmitted with the corporate officer(s) signatures attesting to adoption of the amendment, or a copy of the signed amended bylaws should be included.” Emphasis added.</p> <p>On May 12, 2014, the LBCGLA submitted signed bylaws and has met the requirements of § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as a Category 3 customer. On May 16, 2014, the NAAC submitted signed amendments to its bylaws and has met the requirements of § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as a Category 3 customer. The BEC does not have signed bylaws on file with the Commission and has not satisfied the requirements of Public Utilities Code § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as Category 3 customers.</p> <p>As noted below, the amount of the award granted on this claim is the same as that which would have been granted if BEC were found to be a customer.</p>
16		X	<p>Pursuant to D.98-04-059, the request is deemed complete on May 16, 2014, when the NAAC submitted eligibility documentation required by the July 8, 2010 ruling in A.10-11-015</p>

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION****A. Claimant's contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).**

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
<p><b>1. Outreach on Smart Grid Technologies is Necessary in Light of the Previous Smart Meter Outreach Issue.</b></p> <p>The Joint Parties argued that outreach projects were especially necessary for PG&amp;E given the previous response to Smart Meters and the fact that ratepayers are pre-disposed to distrusting PG&amp;E due a variety of factors, including the San Bruno gas pipeline explosion and general skepticism as to new technology.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D.13-03-032; pp. 61-62.</li> <li>• JP Reply Testimony; p. 5.</li> <li>• JP Opening Brief; pp. 13-14.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed, <i>but see</i> comments in Part III.C., below.</p>
<p><b>2. The Proposed Outreach Project was Rife with Ambiguity and Lacked Specificity.</b></p> <p>The Joint Parties repeatedly argued that the outreach project, as proposed, was simply too vague and ambiguous to approve without significant modifications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D.13-03-032; pp. 59, 64-67.</li> <li>• JP Reply Testimony; pp. 3, 6-7.</li> <li>• JP Opening Brief; pp. 21-25.</li> <li>• JP Reply Brief; pp. 3-6.</li> <li>• JP Comments on Proposed Decision; pp. 3-4.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed, <i>but see</i> comments in Part III.C., below.</p>
<p><b>3. People of Color and Low-Income Communities Are in Desperate Need for Outreach.</b></p> <p>The Joint Parties' central argument to this matter was that people of color, low-income communities, hard to reach ratepayers, new immigrants, and disenfranchised communities need proper foundational education. Without this education, these customers could have concerns regarding the impact of the Smart Grid on health, electricity costs, and customer privacy. Also, the Commission did indicate in the proposed decision that the proposed project had met the criteria of pinpointing a specific concern, gap, or program that needs to be addressed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D.13-03-032; pp. 61 and 64.</li> <li>• JP Motion for Party Status; pp 2-3.</li> <li>• JP Testimony; pp. 11-12.</li> <li>• JP Reply Testimony; pp. 4 and 7.</li> <li>• JP Opening Brief; pp. 6-9.</li> <li>• JP Reply Brief; p. 3.</li> <li>• JP Comments on Proposed Decision; pp. 3-4.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed, <i>but see</i> comments in Part III.C., below.</p>

<p>4. <b>There Were Significant Flaws in the Proposed Outreach Project, Such As the Exclusion of Communities of Color from the Outreach Project.</b></p> <p>Throughout the proceeding, the Joint Parties identified numerous flaws in both PG&amp;E’s foundational research supporting its proposed outreach pilot and flaws in the proposed project itself, many of which resulted from the lack of specificity in the proposed project. For example, the Joint Parties raised repeatedly that although PG&amp;E’s witnesses and data responses assured that communities of color were included in the outreach pilots, there was no inclusion of them within the pilot’s vague language.</p> <p>Additionally, the Joint Parties identified other flaws in the proposed pilot project, including the lack of focus on cost-related issues, the lack of third-party outreach, and no identified collaborations with community-based organizations.</p> <p>Although the Commission did not directly address the flaws identified by the Joint Parties, in accordance with §1802(i), the Joint Parties have “substantially assisted the Commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer.” This substantial contribution is demonstrated through the Joint Parties arguments as to ambiguity and the large number of flaws in the proposed project proposal that led to the Commission’s ultimate denial of this proposed project. As further directed, “Where the customer’s participation has resulted in substantial contribution, even if the decision adopts that customer’s contention or</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D.13-03-032; pp. 64-67.</li> <li>• JP Testimony; pp. 6-17.</li> <li>• JP Opening Brief; pp. 10-12, 14-20.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed, <i>but see</i> comments in Part III.C., below.</p>
---	---	---

<p>recommendation only in part, the Commission may award the customer compensation for all reasonable advocate’s feed, reasonable expert fees, and other reasonable costs incurred by the customer in preparing or presenting that contention and recommendation.”</p>		
<p><b>5. If the Flaws In the Proposed Outreach Project Were Not Remedied, the Commission Should Reject the Proposal</b></p> <p>The Joint Parties indicated that the outreach project was highly necessary in their communities. However, the proposed project flaws and ambiguity had to be remedied or the outreach project should be rejected.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D.13-03-032; p. 65.</li> <li>• JP Opening Brief; pp. 20-21.</li> <li>• JP Comments on Proposed Decision; pp. 3-4.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed, <i>but see</i> comments, in Part III.C. below.</p>
<p><b>6. General Issues and Procedural Requirements</b></p> <p>This category includes procedural requirements, such as reviewing briefs of other parties or filing procedural or discovery issues. For example, included in this category is the Joint Parties’ Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation and Request for an ALJ Ruling On Showing of Significant Financial Hardship.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For examples on general or procedural issues, please see JP Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation or refer to cross-examination scheduling materials.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed, <i>but see</i> comments, in Part III.C. below.</p>

**B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):**

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<p><b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?<sup>1</sup></b></p>	Yes	Verified.
<p><b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b></p>	No	Verified.
<p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b></p>		
<p><b>d. Intervenor’s Claim of non-duplication:</b></p> <p>The Joint Parties took the unique position of supporting the Education and Outreach Project if the Commission and/or PG&amp;E made significant changes to the program in order to include communities of color, low-income communities, and hard-to-reach</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	

<sup>1</sup> The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p>communities. Thus, their arguments on these issues were unique. The work of the Joint Parties did not overlap with other parties, even when addressing the same issue.</p>	
---	--

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):**

<p><b>Concise explanation as to how the cost of claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate)</b></p>	<p><b>CPUC Verified</b></p>
<p><b>a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate)</b></p> <p>The Joint Parties’ request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of approximately \$47,777 as the reasonable cost of their participation in this proceeding.</p> <p>The Joint Parties’ advocacy reflected in D.13-03-032 addressed broad policy matters from the perspective of for low-income communities and communities of color. For the most part, the Joint Parties cannot easily identify precise monetary benefits to ratepayers from their work related to D.13-03-032, given the complex nature of the issues presented.</p> <p>The Joint Parties identified flaws in the proposed outreach project that no other party addressed, including the need for disenfranchised communities to receive information. Additionally, the Joint Parties were the only intervenor that was supportive of the proposed outreach project if significant changes were made. Additionally, the Joint Parties did point out significant flaws in the proposed outreach project through various methods, such as data requests and cross-examination of PG&amp;E’s outreach expert. Ultimately, the Commission followed the Joint Parties’ recommendation to reject the proposed outreach project if no modifications were made.</p> <p>For all these reasons, the Commission should find that the Joint Parties’ efforts have been productive.</p>	<p>Verified, <i>but see</i> “CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments” in Part III.C.</p>
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</b></p> <p>This Request for Compensation includes approximately 214.6 total hours for the Joint Parties’ attorneys and staff. The Joint Parties submits that this is a reasonable amount of time, given the complex issues examined, as well as the wide variety resulting in D.13-03-032. These hours were devoted to substantive pleadings as well as to procedural matters.</p> <p>The Joint Parties’ request is also reasonable because they were as efficient as possible in staffing this proceeding. Although Mr. Gnaizda is the most senior member of the legal team, much of the work in the matter was tasked to Ms. Swaroop and Mr. Brown. In addition, Mr. Brown was given substantive tasks, such as cross-examination and briefing; at a rate that is half of</p>	<p>Verified, <i>but see</i> “CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments” in Part III.C.</p>

Ms. Swaroop’s and less than a quarter of Mr. Gnaizda’s.		
<b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</b>		See “CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments” in Part III.C.  [1]
A. Outreach on Smart Grid Technologies is Necessary in Light of the Previous Smart Meter Outreach Issue.	3.6%	
B. The Proposed Outreach Project Was Rife with Ambiguity and Lacked Specificity.	8.7%	
C. People of Color and Low-Income Communities Are in Desperate Need for Outreach.	21.6%	
D. There Were Significant Flaws in the Proposed Outreach Project, Such As the Exclusion of Communities of Color from the Outreach Project.	38.4%	
E. If the Flaws In the Proposed Outreach Project Were Not Remedied, the Commission Should Reject the Proposal	2.4%	
F. General Issues and Procedural Requirements	25.3%	
Total	100%	

**B. Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Robert Gnaizda	2012	21	\$545	See Attachment B	\$11,445	21	\$545.00 [2]	11,445.00
Robert Gnaizda	2013	0.6	\$545	See Attachment B	\$327	0.6	\$555.00 [3]	333.00
Shalini Swaroop	2012	98.1	\$220	See Attachment C	\$21,582	97.9 [4]	\$185.00 [5]	18,111.50
Shalini Swaroop	2013	3.3	\$231	See Attachment C	\$762	3.3	\$190.00 [5]	627.00
Michael Phillips	2012	0.4	\$391	See Attachment D	\$156	0.4	\$390.00	156.00
Faith Bautista	2012	9.5	\$306	See Attachment E	\$2,907	9.5	\$155.00	1,472.50

**PROPOSED DECISION**

Faith Bautista	2013	0.2	\$306	See Attachment E	\$61	0.2	\$155.00 [6]	31.00
Len Canty	2012	0.6	\$306	See Attachment F	\$184	0.6	\$150.00 [7]	90.00
Jorge Corralejo	2012	0.4	\$306	See Attachment G	\$122	0.4	\$155.00 [8]	62.00
Ian Brown	2012	80.5	\$110	See Attachment H	\$8,855	55.9 [9]	\$100.00	5,590.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>					\$46,401	<b>Subtotal:</b>		\$37,918.00
						<b>9% reduction:</b>		\$3,412.62
						<b>Final Subtotal:</b>		\$34,505.38
<b>INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **</b>								
<b>Item</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Basis for Rate*</b>	<b>Total \$</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
Shalini Swaroop	2013	11.3	\$116	See Attachment C	\$1,311	11.3	\$95.00	1,073.50
<b>Subtotal:</b>					\$1,311	<b>Subtotal:</b>		\$1,073.50
<b>COSTS</b>								
<b>#</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Detail</b>			<b>Amount</b>	<b>Amount</b>		<b>\$</b>
	Printing	Printing costs for Commission rulings, internal drafts of filings, copies of cross exhibits, other parties' filings, and discovery documents.			\$65			65.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>					\$65	<b>Subtotal:</b>		\$65.00
<b>TOTAL REQUEST \$:</b>					<b>\$ 47,777</b>	<b>TOTAL AWARD \$:</b>		<b>\$35,643.88</b>
<p>**We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>								

<b>ATTORNEY INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Member Number</b>	<b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation</b>
Robert Gnaizda	January 9, 1962	32,148	No.
Shalini Swaroop	June 11, 2010	270,609	No.

**C. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments (CPUC completes):**

<b>#</b>	<b>Reason</b>
[1]	<p>The Joint Parties’ request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of \$47,777.00 for their participation in this proceeding. The Joint Parties’ efforts in this proceeding focused exclusively on only one of the six proposed pilots – the Smart Grid Customer Outreach and Education pilot – and the least technical in nature. Ultimately, this outreach pilot was not approved by the Commission because the pilot failed to meet the requirements of pilot criteria including providing a unique or non-duplicative approach to outreach and a lack of specificity in its proposal.</p> <p>Substantial contribution, for intervenor compensation decisions, can occur when the issues addressed are not approved in the final decision. Here, however, many of the alleged contributions of the Joint Parties do not meet the requirement for substantial contribution as enumerated in past Commission proceedings, namely, assisting the Commission’s analysis of the issues. <i>See e.g.</i>, D.06-03-001.</p> <p>During the pre-hearing conference for the proceeding, all parties were given the opportunity to have issues added to the scope of the proceeding. The Joint Parties made no attempt to have their policy concerns added to the list and therefore, all but one of the issues cited by the Joint Parties in their request for intervenor compensation are not specifically within the scope of the proceeding.</p> <p>In the scoping memo, at page 4-5, the issues to be addressed in A.11-11-017 are presented. Under the heading “Review of Proposed Pilots”, two sub-headings can generously be interpreted as encapsulating the positions advocated for by the Joint Parties: reasonableness of the proposed pilots in terms of need and costs and ensuring cost effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis [of the Pilots].</p> <p>As such, because the work focused on one pilot and the least technical pilot, and because Joint Parties’ work did not specifically fall within the scope of the proceeding, the total amount of compensation for the Joint Parties must be reduced. After reviewing the Joint Parties’ submitted time sheets, the Commission determined a 9% reduction to the “Specific Claim” request is warranted.</p>

<sup>2</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California’s website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch> .

[2]	The Commission adopted a 2010 and 2011 hourly rate for Gnaizda of \$535 in D.12-07-015. We apply the 2.2% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-281 to adopt an hourly rate of \$545 for Gnaizda's 2012 work in A.11-11-017.
[3]	We apply the 2.0% COLA adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-287 to adopt an hourly rate of \$555.00 for Gnaizda's 2013 work in A.11-11-017.
[4]	On February 15, 2012, Swaroop's time entry lists 0.2 hours for "Sending analysis to Tom Bottorff." The Commission does not compensate for the work of attorneys when it is clerical, as the costs associated with such tasks are built into the established rates. <i>See</i> D.11-07-024.
[5]	Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$220 for Swaroop's work performed in 2012 and \$231 for Swaroop's work performed in 2013. An hourly rate for Swaroop has not been requested from the Commission in the past. Swaroop became a licensed member of the California Bar in June of 2010. We base Swaroop's new rates on the 2012 and 2013 rates described in Resolution ALJ-287 for attorney intervenors in Swaroop's experience range and also apply the Cost of Living Adjustments of both Res. ALJ- 281 and Res. ALJ-287. We adopt an hourly rate of \$185 for Swaroop's 2012 work and an hourly rate of \$190 for Swaroop's 2013 work.
[6]	Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$306 for Faith Bautista's work in 2012 and 2013. The Commission adopted a 2010 and 2011 hourly rate for Bautista of \$150 in D.12-07-015. The experience provided for Bautista in the current claim is substantially similar to that used to establish Bautista's rate in D.12-07-015, a decision where Bautista was found to be an advocate but not an expert. We apply the 2010 and 2011 rate in this decision. We apply the 2.2% COLA adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-281 to adopt an hourly rate of \$155 for Bautista's 2012 work. In addition, when we apply the 2.0% 2013 COLA adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-287 to Bautista's rate, the rate remains unchanged once rounded down to the nearest five-dollar increment.
[7]	The experience provided for Canty in the current claim for intervenor compensation is substantially similar to that used to establish Canty's rate in D.12-07-015, a decision where Canty was found to not be an expert, but rather to be an advocate. The previously adopted hourly rate for Canty, in 2011, was \$150. When we apply the 2012 2.2% COLA adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-281 to Canty's rate, the rate remains unchanged once rounded down to the nearest five-dollar increment.
[8]	Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$306 for Corralejo's work in 2012. The Commission adopted a 2011 hourly rate for Carralejo of \$150.00 in D.12-07-15, a decision where Carralejo was found to be an advocate rather than an expert. We apply the 2.2% COLA adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-281 to adopt an hourly rate of \$155 for Corralejo's 2012 work.
[9]	An hourly rate for Brown has not been requested from the Commission in the past. In D.13-10-014, a law student with a comparable level of experience was awarded a rate of \$100. We apply this hourly rate to Brown's 2012 work.  Brown spent 38.1 hours outlining and writing the Joint Parties' Opening Brief. After completion, Swaroop spent 24.6 hours reviewing, editing, and "re-writing [the] opening brief." Such work is duplicative and not compensable by the Commission. <i>See</i> D.11-05-016. As such, 24.6 hours have been removed from Brown's reported hours.

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	No.	
<b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(2)(6))?</b>	Yes.	

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles rely on the July 8, 2011 ALJ ruling in A.10-11-015 to support their claim as eligible as Category 3 customers.
2. The July 8, 2011 ALJ ruling in A.10-11-015 required Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles to submit signed bylaws with their claim in this proceeding in order to satisfy the requirements of § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as Category 3 customers.
3. On May 12, 2014, Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles submitted signed bylaws and satisfied the requirements of § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as a Category 3 customer.
4. On May 16, 2014, National Asian American Coalition submitted signed amendments to its bylaws and satisfied the requirements of § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as a Category 3 customer.
5. Black Economic Council does not have signed bylaws on file with the Commission and has not satisfied the requirements of Public Utilities Code § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as Category 3 customers.
6. Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles have made a substantial contribution to Decision 13-03-032 but only Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles and National Asian American Coalition are customers eligible for compensation, pursuant to § 1802(b)(1).

7. The requested hourly rates for National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
8. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
9. The total of reasonable compensation is \$35,643.88.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

The claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812.

**ORDER**

1. National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles are awarded \$35,643.88.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles the total award. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning May 16, 2014, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of The Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles' request was completed, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.

**APPENDIX**  
**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D.13-03-032		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A.11-11-017		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Hymes		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Pacific Gas & Electric Company		

**Intervenor Information**

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Claim Date</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier?</b>	<b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b>
The Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	05/20/2013	\$47,777.00	\$35,643.88	No.	See Part III.C of this decision.

**Advocate Information**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	National Asian American Coalition	\$545.00	2012	\$545.00
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	National Asian American Coalition	\$545.00	2013	\$555.00
Shalini	Swaroop	Attorney	National Asian American Coalition	\$220.00	2012	\$185.00
Shalini	Swaroop	Attorney	National Asian American Coalition	\$231.00	2013	\$190.00

Michael	Phillips	Expert	The Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$391.00	2012	\$390.00
Faith	Bautista	Advocate	National Asian American Coalition	\$306.00	2012	\$155.00
Faith	Bautista	Advocate	National Asian American Coalition	\$306.00	2013	\$155.00
Len	Canty	Expert	The Black Economic Council	\$306.00	2012	\$150.00
Jorge	Corralejo	Advocate	Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$306.00	2012	\$155.00
Ian	Brown	Law Student	National Asian American Coalition	\$110.00	2012	\$100.00

**(END OF APPENDIX)**